



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/277,373	03/29/1999	MASAAKI IMAI	103014	3450
25944	7590	06/05/2002		
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			EXAMINER	KENDALL, CHUCK O
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2122	
DATE MAILED: 06/05/2002				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/277,373	IMAI, MASAAKI
Examiner	Art Unit	
Chuck O Kendall	2122	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 March 2002.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is the response to the communication received on Jan 8, 2002 Amendment under 37 CFR § 1.111. Reconsideration of the instant application is requested by applicants. All such supporting documentation has been placed of record in the file. Claims 1-19 are pending in this application. Corrections have been made to rejections to reflect that prior art is being cited under 102(e).

Response to Arguments

Regarding rejection of the claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e): Examiner has evaluated applicant's arguments and Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Otto USPN 5,706,431.

Regarding claim 1 (Amended), Otto anticipates A peripheral device connected to a network comprising:

Art Unit: 2122

a transmission unit that performs transmission and reception of data over the network to and from another peripheral device connected to the network; [2:33-45 see node and see definitlion of node on 3:1-5]

a memory that stores a software program to be used by the peripheral device for executing prescribed operations[2:27-28]

a type judgement unit that judges whether the another peripheral device stores, in a rewritable manner, a same type of software program as the software program stored in the memory, the same type of software program being software to be used by the another peripheral device for executing prescribed operations;[2:30-40, see current status and revisions, and revision required also refer to fig 5(555)].

an old/new judgement unit that, when the type judgement unit judges that the another peripheral device stores the same type of software program in a rewritable manner, judges which of the same type of software program stored in the another peripheral device and the software program stored in the memory is older; and [fig 5,(500)]

a first rewrite unit that, when the new/old judgement unit judges that the same type of software program stored in the another peripheral device is older than the software stored in the memory, rewrites the same type of software program stored in the another peripheral device into the software program stored in the memory. [fig 5,(560,565)]

2. (Amended) A peripheral device as claimed in claim 1, wherein the memory stores the software program in a rewritable manner, and further comprising a second rewrite unit that when the old/new judgement unit judges that the same type of software program stored in the another peripheral device is newer than the software stored in the memory, rewrites the software program stored in the memory into the same type of software program stored in the another peripheral device. [2:27-28]

3. (Amended) A peripheral device as claimed in claim 1, wherein the type judgement unit performs judgement for all other peripheral devices connected to the network; [2:43-44, cites first second and third thereof] and the old/new judgement unit performs judgement on the all other devices that are judged to store the same type of software program by the type judgement unit [fig 5, (500)]

Regarding claim 4, see reasoning in claim 1.

Regarding claim 5, see reasoning in claim 3, with regards to language for all other devices see [5: 40-45 for transmitting between levels and refer to drawings in fig 1 which shows interconnections and communications between higher levels, subsequently worst case scenario during a search all nodes are traversed].

Regarding claim 6, see reasoning in claim 1.

Regarding claim 7, see reasoning in claim 2.

Regarding claim 8, see reasoning in claim 5.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9 – 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oto in view of Herman et al USPN 5,737,536 hereinafter Herman.

Regarding claim 9 (Amended), Otto discloses all the claimed limitations as applied in claim 6. Otto does not explicitly disclose a rewrite prevention unit for prevention updating. However, Hermann discloses preventing updating [2:43-47]. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Otto with Herman to implement the instant claimed invention because, it's a common practice during updating for controlling access to shared data [2:43-47].

Regarding claim 10 see reasoning in claim 1, and with reference to a second rewriting unit, see 12:50-53, for nodes are responsible for detecting and updating/revising between nodes.

Regarding claim 11,14 & 16 see claim 5 for reasoning.

Regarding claim 12 see claim 1 for reasoning.

Regarding claim 13 see claim 2 for reasoning.

Regarding 15 see claim 1 for reasoning.

Regarding 16 see claim 1 for reasoning.

Regarding claim 18 see claim 1 for reasoning, prior art cites from column 5 that, "node" could be a station, terminal (portable or not) that is capable of communicating signals, examiner interprets this as a network printer

Regarding to claim 19 see claim 1 and 18 for reasoning.

Conclusion

This action is made Final Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action. see MPEP § 706.07 (a).

Correspondence Information

Any inquires concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chuck O. Kendall who may be reached via telephone at (703) 308-6608. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday between 8:00 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. est.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, *Greg Morse* can be reached at (703) 308-4789.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

For facsimile (fax) send to 703-7467239 official and 703-7467240 draft

Chuck O. Kendall

Software Engineer Patent Examiner
United States Department of Commerce


GREGORY MORSE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100